

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are all the claims pending in the present application. Claims 3, 4, 14, 15, 17, 21, and 24 are withdrawn from consideration. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 6 is also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly failing to set forth the subject matter which Applicants regard as their invention. Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 12, 13, 16, 20, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Koreeda (US Patent No. 5,890,137) in view of O'Leary (US Patent No. 6,609,113). Claims 7, 10, 11, 18, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Koreeda in view of Dogac (Dogac, Asusman, Ozsu, M. Tamer & Ulusoy, Ozjur. Current Trends in Data Management Technology. Idea Group Publishing,, Hershey, PA. 1999. pp. 41-42) and Davis (Davis, Steven. Pragmatics: A Reader. Oxford University Press. New York, New York. 1991. pp. 217-219). Claims 8, 9, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Koreeda, Dogac, and Davis, and in further view of Lomax (Lomax, Paul. *Learning VBScript*. O'Reilly & Associates, Inc. Sebastopol, California. 1997. pp. 457-459).

§ 101 and § 112 Rejections - Claim 6

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for the reasons set forth on pages 2-3 of the present Office Action. Applicants amend claim 6, as indicated herein, and believe that these amendments obviate the Examiner's rejections of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and §112, second paragraph.

§103(a) Rejections - (Koreeda / O'Leary) - Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 12, 13, 16, 20, and 23

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 12, 13, 16, 20, and 23 are rejected for the reasons set forth on pages 3-10 of the present Office Action. Applicants traverse these rejections at least based on the following reasons.

With respect to independent claim 1, the Examiner acknowledges that Koreeda does not disclose all of the features set forth in claim 1 (see pages 5-6 of present Office Action). The Examiner, however, believes that O'Leary makes up for the deficiencies of Koreeda. Specifically, the Examiner cites all of the sections of the claims that he believes are satisfied by Koreeda and O'Leary, and states that:

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Koreeda by incorporating a storage means for storing user information and settlement means information, as disclosed by O'Leary, and then extracting that information for use, as disclosed by O'Leary, to provide allow for minimal repeated user entry of information and automatic completion of forms.

In response, Applicants submit that it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Koreeda based on the teachings of O'Leary, to arrive at the present invention, as nowhere does O'Leary disclose or suggest user-information storage means and/or purchase instruction receiving means that constitute an agent device. Thee wallet 215, which allegedly corresponds to the claimed agent device, is simply software that can be downloaded and installed from a website at a user terminal. See col. 9, lines 8-20 of O'Leary. The wallet that is disclosed in O'Leary clearly is not related to an agent device. Therefore, at least based on the foregoing, Applicants submit that independent claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the applied references, either alone or in combination.

With respect to independent claim 6, Applicants submit that this claim is patentable at least based on reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to claim 1. Further, with respect to claim 6, Applicants submit that neither Koreeda nor O'Leary discloses or suggest at least, "pre-registering ID information of the user, information regarding the user, and information regarding settlement means held by the user, in association with each other in a database of said agent device." The Examiner does not even address this particular claimed feature, and nowhere do either of the applied references disclose or suggest this feature. Therefore, at least based on the foregoing, Applicants maintain that claim 6 is patentably distinguishable over the applied references, either alone or in combination.

Applicants submit that independent claim 16 is patentable at least based on reasons set forth above with respect to claims 1 and 6.

Applicants submit that independent claims 12, 13, 20, and 23 are patentable at least based on reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Applicants submit that dependent claims 2 and 5 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependencies from claim 1.

§103(a) Rejections (Koreeda / Dogac / Davis) - Claims 7, 10, 11, 18, and 22

With respect to claims 7, 10, 11, 18, and 22, Applicants submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been led to combine Davis with Koreeda and/or Dogac, to arrive at the present invention. Davis is simply an article related to pragmatics and linguistics (specifically, responding to indirect speech acts), whereas Koreeda and Dogac are directed to technical inventions (e.g., Koreeda is directed to an online shopping system). Therefore, at least based on the foregoing, Applicants submit that one skilled in the art would not have been motivated to

combine the applied references, to arrive at the present invention; and Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 7, 10, 11, 18, and 22.

§103(a) Rejections (Koreeda / Dogac / Davis / Lomax) - Claims 8, 9, and 19

First, Applicants submit that claims 8, 9, and 19 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies from independent claims 7 and 18. Lomax does not make up for the deficiencies of the other applied references.

Further, with respect to claim 9, the Examiner cites col. 2, lines 44-56 of Koreeda as allegedly satisfying the features set forth in claim 9. However, the cited portion of Koreeda only discloses that selective product data can be downloaded from a store system, however this downloading does not denote that purchase-instruction inputting means is prepared separately from instruction means included in the contents of the browsed merchant site. Accordingly, since the features set forth in claim 9 are not satisfied, Applicants submit that claim 9 is patentably distinguishable over the applied references, either alone or in combination.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U. S. Application No. 09/775,591

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. Q62966

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER



Diallo T. Crenshaw
Registration No. 52,778

Date: February 28, 2006